

REMARKS

Claims 11 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over JP 2-71084 (JP '084). Applicant has cancelled Claim 11, without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect to this claim. However, with respect to Claim 17, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the features defined in independent Claim 17. More specifically, JP '084 fails to disclose or suggest a vehicle that is "a rear-wheel drive vehicle," as recited in independent Claim 17. Additionally, JP '084 fails to disclose or suggest a rear-wheel drive vehicle in which "the front wheel is 10% - 60% greater in rigidity than the rear wheel," as also recited in independent Claim 17.

First, JP '084 fails to disclose or suggest a vehicle that is "a rear-wheel drive vehicle." Instead, JP '084 is specifically directed to improve steering performance caused by under-steer in *front-wheel drive vehicles*, by using wheels lighter in weight for the rear wheels than for the front wheels, while using wheels of greater strength for the front wheels than for the rear wheels. In contrast, the object of the invention of independent Claim 17 is to improve the steering ability in *rear-wheel drive vehicles* by enhancing the capability of vibration convergence of the front wheel using a difference in rigidity between the front wheel and the rear wheel.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 17 is directed to a vehicle, and not merely to a tire wheel set. Accordingly, the language found in the body

We note, as pointed out by the Examiner, that Nelson discloses the use of particle-borne component-binding moieties in different parts of its various microfluidic devices (*see* Findings of Fact 6 and 7, above).

However, Nelson's component-binding moieties are intended to remain in either the enrichment zone or affinity zones, with the component of interest being eluted therefrom (*see, e.g.*, Nelson at col. 21, l. 13, through col. 22, l. 13 (Example 2); col. 22, l. 15, through col. 23, l. 54 (Example 3)). Thus, since Nelson's component-binding moieties do not appear to move from their designated zones within the device, we see no apparent specific reason why a person of ordinary skill would have given Nelson's device a separate source of material to replenish the component-binding moieties. Moreover, we do not see any clearly articulated reasoning from the Examiner explaining why one of ordinary skill viewing the cited references would have considered it obvious for Nelson's device to contain a separate source, or reservoir, for the component-binding moieties.

It is well settled that the "Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) must consider all claim limitations when determining patentability of an invention over the prior art." *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Because the Examiner has not explained why every limitation in claim 1 would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, we agree with Appellants that the Examiner has not made out a case of *prima facie* obviousness. We therefore reverse the Examiner's obviousness rejection of claims 1-23.

REVERSED

Appeal 2007-3733
Application 10/613,220

lp

CALIPER LIFE SCIENCES, INC.
605 FAIRCHILD DRIVE
MOUNTAIN VIEW CA 94043-2234

17, ll. 33-47). Nelson does not disclose a separate reservoir or “source” for the component-binding moieties in either the enrichment channel or the main electrophoretic flowpath.

PRINCIPLES OF LAW

As stated in *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992):

[T]he examiner bears the initial burden . . . of presenting a *prima facie* case of unpatentability. . . . After evidence or argument is submitted by the applicant in response, patentability is determined on the totality of the record, by a preponderance of evidence with due consideration to persuasiveness of argument.

When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make “a searching comparison of the claimed invention – *including all its limitations* – with the teaching of the prior art.” *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Thus, “obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim.” *CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)). Moreover, as the Supreme Court recently stated, “*there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.*” *KSR Int’l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007) (quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (emphasis added)).

ANALYSIS

We agree with Appellants that the Examiner has not explained where or why the cited references disclose or suggest a microfluidic device having a “source” for the component-binding moieties, wherein the source is separate from a binding region fluidly coupled to or within the first channel.

4. Nelson describes microfluidic devices useful in separating and detecting compounds of interest in a number of applications, including “high throughput screening, for genomics and pharmaceutical applications such as gene discovery, drug discovery and development, and clinical development; for point-of-care in vitro diagnostics; for molecular genetic analysis and nucleic acid diagnostics; for cell separations including cell isolation and capture; and for bioresearch generally” (Nelson, col. 2, ll. 61-67). Nelson’s devices comprise “at least an enrichment channel and a main electrophoretic flowpath The enrichment channel serves to enrich a particular fraction of a liquid sample for subsequent movement through the main electrophoretic flowpath” (Nelson, col. 2, ll. 48-53).

5. Nelson discloses a number of elements that correspond to claim 1’s “component-binding moiety.” Specifically, Nelson discloses that the enrichment channel can contain component-binding materials such as affinity adsorbents, metal chelating agents, Protein G, or antibodies, which can be bound to matrices of insoluble particles, or be membrane-bound (*see* Nelson, col. 5, l. 12, through col. 6, l. 53). Nelson discloses an example in which antibody-coated magnetic beads are used to bind to desired targets in the enrichment zone (*id.* at col. 21, l. 13, through col. 22, l. 13 (Example 2)). Nelson also exemplifies using magnetic beads to bind DNA in the enrichment zone (*id.* at col. 22, l. 15, through col. 23, l. 54 (Example 3)).

6. Nelson also discloses that, in certain embodiments, “affinity zones” can be placed in the main electrophoretic path to capture components of interest (Nelson, col. 17, ll. 9-33; col. 18, ll. 28-32; *see also* Figures 16 and 18). The affinity zones may contain the DNA-specific or protein-specific binding moieties similar to those used in the enrichment channel (*id.* at col.

2. Claim 1 requires the microfluidic device component to have:
- (a) a first microscale channel having a gel-filled region for separating components within a sample;
 - (b) a second microscale channel downstream from the first channel, the second channel being fluidly coupled to the first channel and also configured to contain a particle set;
 - (c) a binding region which is fluidly coupled to the first channel, or which is within the first channel;
 - (d) a source of a component-binding moiety fluidly coupled to the binding region, the component-binding moiety being capable of binding to a component of interest;
 - (e) a first detection region within the first channel; and
 - (f) a second detection region within the second channel, the second detection region including a particle stacking region.

3. Because the “source of a component-binding moiety . . . capable of binding to the component of interest” must be “fluidly coupled to the binding region,” we interpret claim 1 as requiring the “source” to be a separate structure from the binding region. This interpretation is consistent with the Specification, which discloses a particle well 112, fluidly coupled to binding channel 110 (Spec. 12; *see also* Figure 1). The Specification discloses that the “particle set is released from particle well 112 into binding channel 110. The particle set with the components [of interest] attached or adsorbed onto the particle member types is then directed to detection region 114, where the particle member types of the particle set are optionally stacked” (Spec. 12; *see also* Figure 1).

Appellants argue that they “are unable to identify any structure taught by Nelson that corresponds to Applicants’ claimed ‘source of a component-binding moiety fluidly coupled to the binding region’” (Reply Br. 5). Appellants further contend that “Spence is silent with regard to a channel comprising a gel filled component separation region and so cannot teach a source of a component-binding moiety fluidly coupled to a binding region that is fluidly coupled to or within such a channel” (*id.* at 5-6).

The issue with respect to this rejection, therefore, is whether the Examiner has shown that a device having the configuration of features recited in claim 1, including the “source of a component-binding moiety fluidly coupled to the binding region,” would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claim 1 recites a system having the following components:
 - (i) a microfluidic device having a specified arrangement of two channels and several regions;
 - (ii) a fluid direction system fluidly coupled to the microfluidic device, the fluid direction system being configured to transport a fluid sample through the two channels;
 - (iii) a control system operably linked to the fluid direction system, the control system being configured to instruct the fluid direction system to transport the sample through the two channels; and
 - (iv) a detection system configured to be positioned proximal to first and second detection regions in the microfluidic device.

(iv) a detection system which is configured to be positioned proximal to the first and second detection regions.

THE REJECTION

The Examiner applies the following documents in rejecting the claims:

Nelson	US 6,007,690	Dec. 28, 1999
Spence	US 6,540,895 B1	Apr. 1, 2003

The following rejection is before us for review:

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Nelson and Spence. (Ans. 3-5).

ISSUE

The Examiner cites Nelson as disclosing “microfluidic devices comprising several alternative embodiments” (Ans. 3). The Examiner contends that several of Nelson’s embodiments meet most of the limitations recited in claim 1 for the microfluidic device (*see id.* at 3-4).

The Examiner concedes that Nelson “does not particularly point out a control system linked to the fluid direction system” (*id.* at 4). Pointing out that Spence “teaches cell sorting utilizing microfluidic systems controlled by a computer or microprocessor that control fluid flow,” the Examiner contends that one of ordinary skill would have considered it obvious “to modify the teachings of Nelson et al to include a control system to instruct fluid direction as taught by Spence et al because procedures can be programmed using any suitable software that can perform a variety of functions” (*id.* at 5 (citing Spence, col. 15, ll. 5-27)).

Appellants contend that neither of the cited references discloses or suggests all of the limitations in claim 1 (App. Br. 5). Specifically,

anthropology and modern criminal investigation” (Spec. 1). Thus, the Specification discloses “devices, systems, and kits for detecting a component of interest in a complex mixture” (*id.* at 2).

Claims 1-23 are pending and on appeal (App. Br. 2).¹ Claim 1 is representative and reads as follows:

1. A system for detecting a component of interest in a sample, the system comprising:
 - (i) a microfluidic device comprising:
 - (a) a first microscale channel comprising a gel filled component separation region;
 - (b) a second microscale channel downstream from the first channel that is fluidly coupled to the first channel, the second channel configured to contain a particle set therein;
 - (c) a binding region fluidly coupled to or within the first channel;
 - (d) a source of a component-binding moiety fluidly coupled to the binding region which is capable of binding to the component of interest;
 - (e) a first detection region within the first channel; and
 - (f) a second detection region within the second channel which includes a particle stacking region within the second detection region;
 - (ii) a fluid direction system fluidly coupled to the microfluidic device, which fluid direction system is configured to transport the sample through at least the first and second microscale channels;
 - (iii) a control system operably linked to the fluid direction system, which control system is configured to instruct the fluid direction system to deliver or transport the sample through at least the first and second microscale channels; and

¹ Appeal Brief filed February 8, 2007.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Ex parte H. GARRETT WADA, and MATTHEW B. MURPHY

Appeal 2007-3733
Application 10/613,220
Technology Center 1600

Decided: January 14, 2008

Before DEMETRA J. MILLS, ERIC GRIMES, and FRANCISCO PRATS,
Administrative Patent Judges.

PRATS, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 involving claims to a system for detecting a component of interest in a biological sample. The Examiner has rejected the claims as obvious. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b). We reverse.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THE INVENTION

Detecting a DNA molecule or protein of interest in a biological sample is "of fundamental value in, e.g., diagnostic medicine, archaeology,

of Claim 17 reciting that the claimed vehicle is rear-wheel drive (“wherein the vehicle is a rear-wheel drive vehicle”) is not merely an intended use. Instead, such language defines a structural difference between the vehicle of Claim 17 and the vehicle of JP '084 (e.g. the drive mechanism in a rear-wheel drive vehicle is connected to the rear wheels and not the front wheels). Further, the Examiner is reminded that all claim limitations must be disclosed or suggested when making a *prima facie* case of unpatentability for obviousness. *See e.g., Ex parte Wada*, Appeal 2007-3733, page 7, Bd. Pat. Ap. Int., 2008 (copy enclosed). Thus, because the “rear wheel drive” feature of Claim 17 is not disclosed or suggested in JP '084, the Examiner has not made the required *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this §013 rejection of Claims 11 and 17 under JP '084.

On pages 3-4 (paragraph 4.a.) of the March 4, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner asserts that he considers the rear wheel drive feature to be an intended use because the claims “lack any additional physical structure for the drive system or the vehicle itself, and thus it is clear that the important feature of the invention is the wheel set, and not the overall vehicle.” Further, the Examiner also asserted: “If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, it then meets the claim. In this case, the wheel set disclosed in Shiba [JP '084] is capable of performing the same functions as the claimed wheel set, regardless of whether located on a FWD or a RWD vehicle.”

In response, Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that the proposition that he cited regarding claim interpretation for an intended use is only relevant when the

intended use is defined in the preamble. *See* MPEP 2112.02(II) (“Preamble Statements Reciting Purpose or Intended Use”) (“If a prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, as recited in the preamble, then it meets the claim.” (emphasis added)). Thus, even assuming *arguendo* that the rear wheel drive feature was an intended use, this feature is defined in the body of the claim, and not in the preamble, and therefore the proposition cited by the Examiner does not apply to the feature at issue. Accordingly, since all claimed features are not disclosed or suggested in JP ‘084, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of Claim 17 for at least this reason.

Second, Applicant respectfully submits that JP ‘084 does not disclose or suggest a rear-drive vehicle in which “the front wheel is 10% - 60% greater in rigidity than the rear wheel,” as defined in independent Claim 17. Applicant respectfully submits that because JP ‘084 is directed to minimizing understeer in a front-wheel drive vehicle, any optimization that takes place would be directed to minimizing understeer. Applicant further submits that, according to the tests conducted by Applicant outlined in the enclosed Declaration Under Rule 37 C.F.R. 1.132 (the “Declaration”), optimizing to minimize understeer in a front-wheel drive vehicle results in an optimal rigidity difference that is different than that defined in Claim 17. For example, Applicant’s tests showed an optimum rigidity difference of greater than 100% when optimizing to minimize understeer in a front-wheel drive vehicle (such as in JP ‘084), and an optimal rigidity difference of between 10 and 60% when optimizing to improve steering stability in a rear-wheel drive vehicle (such as defined in Claim 17).

More specifically, as indicated in the attached Declaration, eleven different wheel sets were produced with the front wheels being of higher rigidity than the rear wheels (wheel sets 1-11 in which the front wheels have rigidities greater than the rigidities of the rear wheels by the following percentages, respectively: 5%; 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 100%, 150%, and 200%) and a single wheel set (wheel set 12) was produced in which the front and rear wheels had the same rigidity (0% difference). Wheel sets 1-12 were attached to a rear wheel drive vehicle and were evaluated for steering stability and riding comfort (which relates to the present invention). Twelve wheel sets of similar characteristics were also mounted to a front wheel drive vehicle and were evaluated for understeer (which relates to JP '084). The results of the tests are shown in Table 1 on page 4 of the Declaration.


As can be seen from Table 1, wheel sets 2-7, in which the front wheel is 10-60% greater in rigidity than the rear wheel, showed increased steering stability, without a reduction in driving comfort, in a rear-wheel drive vehicle, which relates to the present invention of Claim 17. With rigidity differences of 70% and higher, there was a reduced riding comfort. In contrast, Table 1 also shows that the understeer for a front-wheel drive vehicle only improved when the front wheel was at least 100% greater in rigidity than the rear wheel, which relates to the device of JP '084. Thus, Applicant's experiments have shown that the optimal rigidity difference of the invention of Claim 17 is different than the optimal rigidity difference of JP '084. More specifically, because the devices are different (front-wheel drive vs. rear-wheel drive) and the objectives are different (minimizing understeer vs. improving steering stability), the resulting optimal rigidity difference (of

greater than 100%, for example) when optimizing a vehicle corresponding to JP '084 to meet its intended objective is not be the same as the resulting optimal rigidity difference defined in Claim 17(of between 10 and 60%), which is for a different intended objective in a different type of vehicle. Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of independent Claim 17.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
James K. Folker
Registration No. 37,538

August 11, 2008

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080

Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\4386\77653\DA1402.DOC